

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST

No. 382.

Official Organ of the Australasian
Socialist Party.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 25th, 1917.

Registered at the General Post Office, Sydney,
for transmission by post as a Newspaper.

Price: One Penny

The Masque of Life.

By CHARLES DICKENS.

The poor are growing poorer,
And the rich are growing richer;
The cannibal clothier fattens upon
The lean and hungry stitcher:

The mountains of gold which some have roll'd
From above, around, and under,
Burn gloomy-bright as a comet at night,
And should make men weep and wonder.

Ghastly is the Dance of Death,
Ghastlier the Dance of Being—
A Masque fantastical and strange
To the hearing and the seeing.

One man lies on pulpy down,
Another lacks a bed;
One man eats and drinks his fill,
Another hath not bread.

The pale women in the factories,
The children dwarf'd and ugly,
Dives (within his counting-house
Secure) surveyeth snugly.

They cry, "We rot in the dark dens;"
He careth not a tittle;
They cry, "We swoon with toil," but he
Thinks Ten Hours' work too little.

Ghastly is the Dance of Death,
Ghastlier the Dance of Being—
A Masque fantastical and strange
To the hearing and the seeing.

Lo! here comes a reverend Doctor,
In the midst of all our troubles,
Wrangling and grimacing wildly,
Over his own learned bubbles.

And he mingles with the Masquers,
And he dances and he sings,
Scribbling on the eternal Heavens,
His grotesque imaginings.

Meanwhile, in the lanes and alleys,
Souls are slain for want of toneing,
Which might all have sung one touch
Of round music, had they known
More of love and less of preaching.

Ghastly is the Dance of Death,
Ghastlier the Dance of Being—
A Masque fantastical and grim,
To the hearing and the seeing.

Here's a woman deck'd with pearls,
As with stars the midnight sky,
'Clad in smooth and warm excess
And soft superfluity.

Here's another, hung with rags,
As with weeds of snaky motion,
That clasp some mouldering palace wall
On a deserted shore, and crawl
Idly upon the idle ocean.

Here's a thing that's half a saint,
Half a soldier, all a monarch,
Weighing down a people's life,
Yet a blood-embodied Anarch.

Like a bloodhound, lean and fierce,
He gnaws Europe; yet his curship
Talks of God in every act,
And blasphemes him by such worship.

Well, who's next? Oh, here's a flaring
Bonnet Rouge; no mortal stiffer
In maintaining his own rights,
And beheading folks who differ.

Let those last two pair together,
With a death's head for a crown,
And a thigh-bone for a sceptre,
And they'll dance the nations down.

Ghastly is the Dance of Death,
Ghastlier the Dance of Being—
A Masque fantastical and wild,
To the hearing and the seeing.

Next we have a little statesman,
Of pacific disposition,
Frowning like a very Mars,
And talking of his warlike mission.

After him comes a trader,
Bowing till he makes you sick,

Efficiency.

AND THE TAYLOR SYSTEM.

By W. J. T.

The question of speeding up or increased efficiency has been discussed with much heat and little understanding within and out of union circles during the past few weeks.

Increased efficiency or the greatest possible increase in the productivity of labor is an absolutely essential factor, and an integral part of capitalistic production. It is the germ of destruction that will bring about the fall of the present system of society, and one of the constructive features of the state of society which will follow on the socialisation of the means of production by the producing class.

Previous to the discovery of steam and its utilisation as a motive power the production of commodities was for use, inasmuch as the hand craft stage of production was so slow as to leave no surplus beyond the immediate needs of the individual producers. The introduction of steam power and mechanical revolution of weaving caused a complete revolution in industry. The increased efficiency of human labor power through the medium of the home production of textile fabrics by the collective production of the factory. The unequal competition between the hand weavers and the machine was the cause of thousands of hitherto independent producers flocking to the factory towns to become wage slaves. For the first four years of machine production in factories the demand for labor was strong, for the simple reason that as yet the supply of the factory commodities did not reach the demand, but in a very short time, owing to further inventions, the supply exceeded the demand. Then came the evils following over-production, the markets were glutted, factories closed,

While he vends you a slow poison,
Of red-lead and turmeric.

Here's a lord with Sunday club,
Bright and light, to lounge and lunch in,
Closing up the wayside shop,
Where the poor man used to stop,
To drink his beer and eat his lunch in.

Here's a set of idle fellows
(Wrangfully call'd democratic),
Inaugurating their Republic
By breaking glass with stone and clubstick
Up from basement-floor to attic.

Let them mingle with the Masquers,
And with shouting shake each rafter;
In the midst of so much sadness,
These wild knaves but move our laughter.

Dost thou see this man? The morning
Of his life was hard, stern work,
And the evening closes round him,
Desolate, and bare, and dark.

All the toil and sore endeavor,
The sharp fight fought every day,
Leaves him still the same grim foeman,
Now that he is old and grey.

Seest this other man? Birds dancing
In the heavenward breath of Spring,
Perfumed flowers in shelter'd gardens;
Brooks that leap, and laugh, and sing.

Butterflies within the sunshine,
Living in one smile of Fate,
Knowing but the world's adorning,
Are the symbols of his state.

Let both mingle with the Masquers,
And dance on. These sharp extremes
Are the miserable nightmares
That beset our waking dreams.

But the earth is slowly ripening,
Like a great fruit in the sun,
And will learn some better dancing,
Ere the centuries are done.

ed, and wholesale unemployment and starvation was the result. The fierce competition to undersell and rid themselves of this surplus product, caused the manufacturing class to introduce any means that would lessen the cost of production: this included the introduction of women and child labor. A peculiar reaction occurred at this period; the unemployed and starving men who were replaced by other labor banded themselves together with the express purpose of destroying the machines and returning to the prosperous period of hand production, seeing in the machine the source of their miserable conditions.

Social evolution knows no permanent retrogression: the machine fulfilled a human demand, it was a step forward in human intellectual development, and as such could not be destroyed despite the foolish and futile attempts of the Luddites to retard its development.

The successful competitor for the industrial markets of the world, is the man who has at his disposal the best means of speeding up or increasing the efficiency of his workers; either by machine or method of supervision. The introduction of labor saving devices is the chief factor in the displacement of labor.

The typical product of American enterprise may be said to be labor saving machinery. The success in attaining the end designed may be noted in the increased speed with which an article can be turned out, even five hundred times as fast as before, and in some cases much more rapidly. Further achievements of manufacturing machinery may be understood by a few comparisons drawn from several trades. In the hand manufacture of matches a thoroughly competent workman can cut, on an average, 1000 sticks per hour, or 8000 in a working day, which is sufficient for about 150 boxes of ordinary size. The match making machine can cut and dip 17,000,000 matches per day, a number sufficient to fill 300,000 boxes, which represents a ratio of about 6400 to 3 as between the output of machine and hand. The simple and efficient brick-making machine will mould and cut 30,000 bricks in 10 hours, as against the average of 3000 formerly produced by the skilled hand workman in the same time. By machinery also paper covered cigarettes can be filled and rolled at the rate of 500 per minute, giving an average of 30,000 per hour, and 240,000 in a day of eight hours, as against the best hand-made record of 150 per hour, or 1200 per day. This represents a ratio of 200 to 1.

"The hand manufacture of nails formerly furnished occupation for hosts of people who could produce them at the rate of 200 or 300 at the greatest per hour, earning thereby scarcely sufficient money for necessities. Now, by mechanical devices, at least 60,000 nails, either steel wire or cut, can be produced in an hour, or an average of nearly 500,000 per day, greatly reducing the cost of this necessary article."

These are examples of speeding up or more correctly increased efficiency by the introduction of machinery; the result is displacement of labor, increased unemployment. Under a socialistic state of society these mechanical improvements will be used for the direct benefit of the workers by a reduction of the hours of labor, etc.

The reform question of a six-hour day as a means of absorbing the unemployed is closely connected with the improvement of the machine. It is a fact that the machinery used in Australian production is 20 years behind the latest improvements. Granting a six-hour day, by the introduction of up-to-date machines the workers of Australia will produce more in six hours than they now do in eight.

It must not be inferred from the foregoing remarks that I am opposed to a decrease in the hours of toil, but I assert

A New Catechism.

By WOODICUS.

What is faith?
Believing the Almighty will be able to pick up the pieces after a shrapnel shell has hit you.

What is hope?
Believing that if you are obedient to your boss, you'll one day crawl through a hole in the sky.

What is charity?
Knocking a man down, robbing him, and to give him back sixpence, wrapped in biblical text, by way of consolation.

What is honesty?
Refraining from robbery when it doesn't pay.

How is it a scab never shaves and has no hair on his chest?
He rubs his hair off by crawling.

Why don't plutes enlist?
Because their stomachs would get jammed in the trenches.

What is the difference between a plute and a worker?

The first grows a hump on his stomach through shirking. The other grows a hump on his back through working.

How do you know there are no Germans in heaven?
Because we, Britishers, would be unable to understand their language.

And why are there no Germans in hell? Because hell is likely to become a British possession any day.

that as a means of solving the unemployed problem, or even having an appreciable effect on the number of unemployed, it is absolutely barren of the results it seeks to accomplish.

To return to the question of efficiency, the Taylor card system is a clumsy method of speeding up compared with some co-operative systems now in vogue, which include profit-sharing, bonus system, and the effort of the employer to adopt a paternal like attitude towards the employees. An American firm, after giving a detailed account of their co-operative system, sums up with the following remarks: "Our opinion of the work of industrial betterment, is that the care of the animate machinery is at least as important to the manufacturer as the care of the inanimate machinery. The three most important matters for attention should be, health, morals and education, because a more vigorous employee will do more work, a more conscientious employee will do more conscientious work, while a more intelligent employee will do more intelligent work."

Thus we see that the exploiting class will give the workers improved conditions, as a means of speeding up the workers and blinding them to the fact.

The emancipation of the working class will only be accomplished when they have united industrially in such a manner as will enable them to take over the industries for the purpose of producing the necessities of life for use instead of profit.

Until such time, increased exploitation, increased unemployment, and increased misery will be the lot of the toiling millions.

LEIGH HOUSE

Wednesday September 12th.

BENEFIT SOCIAL AND DANCE

In aid of Com. Wagner
Tickets One Shilling

THE MITCHELL LIBRARY

26 NOV. 1917

THE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST.OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AUSTRALASIAN
SOCIALIST PARTY.SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Australia, 4/- per
year; 1/- per quarter. Postage added to
other countries.ORDERS FOR PAPERS to be sent to the
Press Committee, 115 Goulburn Street,
Sydney.

MATTER FOR PUBLICATION.

All articles and matter for publication must
be addressed to the "Press Committee" and
accompanied by the name and address of the
writer (not necessarily for publication).Write on one side of the paper only, and be
sure to write in ink.Rejected manuscript will be returned if
stamps are enclosed for that purpose.

WHEN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION IS DUE.

Every subscriber will be notified by circular
when his subscription runs out. The number
of the last issue to be posted will be indicated.

An Outspoken Dean.

One of the interesting products of the
strike, is a Dean who is not afraid to ex-
press opinions in favour of the strikers.The Dean referred to is Dean Talbot,
who, speaking to a resolution condemn-
ing the strikers and calling upon the
Church people to do everything to assist
the Government, moved at the Anglican
Provincial Synod, said—I am of the deliberate opinion that
there has been a breach of faith with the
workers; that there was a promise made
that the conditions of work should not
be altered; that the promise was more or
less of a nature that even the card system
should not be introduced during the per-
iod of the war. (Voices: No, no.)This has been denied by the Commis-
sioners and by the Government. But the
workers maintain that the promise was
made, and I am just as readyTO BELIEVE THE WORKERS
as I am to believe the Government and
the Commissioners.It is said that the Government has the
right to introduce any system it likes in-
to its own shops. If that be so, then the
workers have an equal right to object,
and to call any such system unjust.The community could not be consid-
ered as apart from the workers. The Go-
vernment's policy was alienating public
sympathy. He could not support a po-
licy of starving the men into submission
by the employment of voluntary labor.
(Dissent.) "It is the duty of every man
who has studied the question closely to
express his opinion without fear or favor,"
declared the Dean, "and I claim that
right. (Hear, hear.) To my mind, the
best way of supporting the Government
would be to ask them to show some spirit
of compromise, to ask them to bend a
little, to ask them to try and put them-
selves in the place of the workers, and
understand this question from the point
of view of the men on strike.Dean Talbot, apart from his inconsis-
tency in going to the "human slaughter
house" in Europe, he being a disciple of
the Prince of Peace, is to be congratulated
upon the stand that he has taken. Expe-
rience is evidently forcing him to real-
ise that the promises of a Government
are not to be relied upon.The fact of him stating that he was
just as ready to believe the workers, will
no doubt ruffle the feelings of the em-
ploying class; who, although the Dean
may not recognise it, are the controlling
factor in the Church.We can well understand Mr. Fuller
when he says:—"I believe that before
long the Dean will regret his hasty intru-
sion into this matter."The Dean had better look to his laurels
of Deanship; for the employing class,
along with their funkies, the high paid
clergy, will make a determined effort to
bring about what Fuller predicts.

The church does not tolerate sympathy

Lessons in Economics.

By A Student.

No. 6.

The Class Struggle.

It is now necessary to explain the ex-
istence of classes—the exploiting class
and the exploited class. Master and
slave. Robber and robbed. An under-
standing of the class struggle is vitally
necessary. We cannot do better than to
quote here in full the chapter on The
Class Struggle from Daniel de Leon's
pamphlet "Woman's Suffrage." It is as
follows:"He who raises the curtain of the his-
tory of the Class Struggle is immediately
struck with the figure of woman as a
leading figure on a tragic stage, herself a
tragic victim—at first sight the tragic
victim. The portentous tragedy with
which the drama of class rule opens sup-
erinduces two errors: First, that woman
was stricken down because of sex. She
was not. Second, that some imp prevail-
ed in a contest for rule over the destin-
ies of the race, hurling it from Arcadian
happiness into sorrow.Curious, even luminous, is the circum-
stance that the Anarchist, that element
among those in revolt against modern so-
ciety, which is most boastful of its en-
lightenment and mental freedom from
"ancient mystifications," is, in this re-
spect, at one with all the known systems
of superstition. With these, the Anar-
chist prates of a Fall of Man—"Once
there was freedom; there is none now,"
with them he holds a language, which,
if it means anything, is pivoted on the
theory of the existence of an "Evil Gen-
ius." There is no such fiend. There was
no such fall.Man—meaning mankind—is, in the
sense-laden language of Carlyle, "a tool-
using animal." When man first made
his appearance on earth he was of all ani-
mal beings the most abjectly helpless.
Nature's foot was planted upon his neck.
She scourged him with droughts and with
floods; with heat and with cold; a toy of
her caprice, now she overwhelmed him
with abundance, then afflicted him with
dearth. The birds that flew over his
head, the beasts that prowled around his
cradle—all were self-sufficient. They
came into being equipped with the tool
requisite to carve their living out of
nature—the lion his fangs; the spider his
pouch of mucilage and thread; the eagle
his beak and talons; the beaver his won-
derful tail; the tiniest wren his bill. Man
alone is born toolless, hence at the start
of his career, inferior to all others.The weapon by which man turned the
tables upon brute creation and upon na-
ture herself, rising to princeliness over the
former and overpowering the latter till
she has become his obedient hand-maid,
was the tool of production, which he at
first painfully fashioned, which in his
hands improved, becoming more power-
ful, that is, fruitful of results, and the de-
velopment of which marks the milestones
of his onward and upward march.
Though in the nature of things the steps
in this evolution are not "recorded," no
historic fact is more authentic. From the
scientific point of view, the Fall of Man
is an idle nursery tale; from the moral
viewpoint it is a slander on the race. Man
rose; he did not fall.In the course of the onward process in
the perfection of the tool the discovery of
the secret of smelting iron marks an
epoch—the first great epoch—in the an-
nals of man. From that time on society
undergoes a radical change. The secret
of smelting iron begets the edged tool—
none of the dainty ones known to-day,
but the ponderous ones that required
muscular strength to wield. Remorse-
less as the law of gravitation, the imper-
ious and ultimately benevolent law that
propelled mankind towards the ever morefor the working class; despite the fact
that it may preach it; for many are the
cases in which its preachers have alien-
ated themselves with the cause of labor,
only to be forced out of the Church alto-
gether, or to realise their economic de-
pendency upon it by accepting a tarnish-
ed to some obscure place in which they can
do no damage.perfect, the ever more powerful, the ever
more fruitful tool of production, wrought
its effect upon early society with the ad-
vent of the iron tool. Those physically
powerful enough to wield the then most
fruitful tool became an aristocracy; those
who could not, fell below. The line of
cleavage was, accordingly, not sex, but
physique. Of course sex qualities contri-
buted to mark the female sex the weaker.
Nevertheless it was not as woman that
she was subordinated. The proof is found
in the fact that woman shared the new
subjection with the males, who, sex dis-
regarded, were unequal to the demands
made by the new apparition—the Iron
Tool.The appearance of iron in the develop-
ment of the tool was, however, potent,
not the sole factor in the development of
the classes. The iron tool imparted to
that development a powerful accelerating
impulse; it did not create the Class
Struggle. Interwoven with the racial
impulse to supply man's deficiency by
straining after the ever more perfect tool
of production, is another sociologic law,
a law that, given certain material condi-
tions, may be said to dictate the Class
Struggle as an early racial necessity.
This leading law may be condensed in a
plain arithmetical formula.Given a society of, say, one hundred
persons, in which, work as they may, all
they can produce is one dollar's worth of
wealth, while five dollar's worth of
wealth is the minimum each would re-
quire for comfort—given such a society,
then its people are upon a level with
brute creation: compelled to devote
their whole existence to the supplying of
their animal needs; ever on the brink of
want; hence, dogged by that worst, most
demoralising of all spectres—the spectre
of want; and, of course, deprived of
leisure—that boon without which no room
is left for mental and spiritual expansion.
In such a society there would be equal-
ity, but the equality would be that of
pauperism, with all the ills that that im-
plies. This is no imaginary picture. It
was the actual condition of our savage
ancestors—it is the condition that the
ripping of society into classes, with the
consequence of the class struggle, had
the instinctive purpose to pull us out of.Of course, there was no "town meet-
ing" called to consider the subject as a
special order of business; there was no
motion made, seconded, debated and car-
ried. The race marches obedient to cer-
tain laws; the more backward it is the
less of a hand does it take in the applica-
tion of these laws. Early man marched
unconsciously in unconscious obedience
to the laws that underlie his progress,
much as a river flows to its destiny. Only
when far advanced, with a fund of past
experience that gives him prescience, does
man take evolution by the hand, so to
speak, and perform an active part in the
process.Early society, accordingly, faced un-
consciously the alternative—either equal-
ity—and then remain rooted in brutish
and brutifying poverty; or, pull out of
the rut—at the price of equality.Unconsciously, instinctively, society
took the latter alternative—instinctively,
unconsciously striking the route of the
valley of the class struggle.It is a plain arithmetical proposition
that, given a social state where the one
hundred persons composing it, work as
they may, can produce only one dollar's
worth of wealth on an average, five dol-
lars' worth being the minimum for com-
fort—it is a plain arithmetical propo-
sition that under such material conditions,
if only as few as five members of the
community secure to themselves the
amount of wealth necessary for freedom
from toil, with the resultant freedom
from want and the fear of want, and the
leisure required for mental and spiritual
expansion—it is a plain arithmetical pro-
position that the consequence must be in-
tensified evil conditions for the large ma-
jority. The ninety-five will then have to
feed the five. Each of the ninety-five be-
ing unable under the then conditions to
produce more than one dollar's worth of
wealth, it follows that out of the ninety-five dollars' worth producible by them
will have to come the twenty-five needed
by the five. Thenceforth the ninety-five
cannot even enjoy the pittance of their
own individual one dollar's worth of the
fruit of their toil. Thenceforth their
share would be seventy dollars' worth of
wealth—less than their product. In short,
slavery arises.The appearance of the Iron Tool may,
perhaps, not have sufficed to rip up so-
ciety into a master and a slave class—
perhaps not. The appearance, however,
of the Iron Tool as an incident in the
law that propelled society towards the
perfection of the tool, coupled with the
law of progress that urged society, at
whatever cost, to pull out of the deep
rut of universal brute conditions—with
the two laws operating together, the ap-
pearance of the Iron Tool accelerated and
placed its decisive stamp upon the course
of events. A new institution—Private
Property in the necessities of production,
land and tool—crystallised into being as
the logical reflex of the altered indus-
trial system. The Communal System was
overthrown, or rather cast off. A ma-
jority fell below, a minority rose above
where it was before. Yet there was no
Fall—no Evil Genius tempting. On the
contrary, mankind is one—whatever the
sex, color, or race of its component hu-
man atoms. The impossibility of Pro-
gress, under material surroundings of
equality of brute conditions, was a doom
upon the whole race; on the other hand,
the Possibility of Progress, under mate-
rial surroundings destined to lead up from
the depth of universal brute conditions,
was a boon universal.Thus arose, such was the progress, to-
gether with its orchestration, that shaped
the classes—Master and Slave. Thus did
woman lose the position of pre-eminence
which the unquestionable evidences of the
"Mother-right" period in earlier Gentile
society attest she once enjoyed. The pro-
cess, together with the reasons, therefore,
point unerringly to the conclusion that
woman's social downfall was not incur-
red as sex, but as a weaker vessel, being
a downfall shared by her fellow weaker
humane of the male sex. Each of the
previous discoveries or inventions, mark-
ing the lower rungs of the ladder by
which the race ascended—such, for in-
stance, as the great discovery of the use
of fire, and the subsequent and equally
great invention of pottery—were discov-
eries and inventions that called for skill
only, vigor of muscle not at all. While
those discoveries and inventions were
a-making, woman's sex qualities readily
enough won and preserved for her the
seat of honor she then enjoyed. The ap-
pearance of the Iron Tool, swung, more-
over, by that social law that drove man-
kind to escape at any price from the so-
cial blind alley of universal equality in
poverty, cleft society in twain, the line
of cleavage being strength—the strength
requisite to render the newly conquered
tool available. The event wrought a verita-
ble tragedy. Seeing this tragedy was
one in which a whole sex, Woman, was
engulfed, a tragedy, moreover, which had
for its sequel, and speedily and success-
ively bore the fruits of specific sex hard-
ships and indignities, that sex appears,
naturally enough at first sight, as the
sole victim in a catastrophe, and the
singled-out objective of a conspiracy.
Though appearances justify the conclu-
sion, closer inspection, fuller information,
rejects it.The subjection of Woman is an inci-
dent in that primal social convulsion, the
outlines of which, though veiled in the
mist of the far distant past, are clearly
discernible—the primal social convulsion
that ripped society into classes, a master
and a subject class, along the line of mus-
cular strength. Woman, physically weak
—weak, that is, in point of muscular
fibre—shared, as a matter of course, the
physical disabilities, hence the social dis-
qualifications of the muscularly less fav-
ored males.With the birth of the classes the Class
Struggle springs up—the struggle be-
tween the upper and the lower class, the
former to maintain, if possible, extend
its authority; the latter to cast off, or,
at least, ease its yoke.From that day on, the history of the
human race, all that is important in that
history, is threaded by the line of the
struggle between the two classes, con-
ducted with varying results, under vary-
ing aspects.—Daniel de Leon.(Lewis H. Morgan's work "Ancient
Society" is recommended as indispens-
able to the understanding of the origin of
the Class Struggle, and, thereby, to the
understanding of the various manifesta-
tions of the struggle.)

Revolutionary Political Action.

A Criticism of a Critic.

By M. FEINBERG.

I was deeply grieved when I discovered that I unconsciously was the cause of dissatisfaction to one of His Majesty's subjects in the person of Com. J. A. D.

He does not seem altogether satisfied with my defence of Revolutionary Political Action in the debate I had with a member, or rather, I should say, members of the Melbourne I.W.W.

The cause of his complaint is that I did not "stress" (to use his own words) that "the vital function of Revolutionary Political Action is to recruit the Industrial Organisation of Labor." To this charge I humbly plead guilty. But I cannot stop at merely pleading guilty; my conscience will not allow me; I must go further and make the confession that I went to do battle with the deliberate intention of not stressing what J. A. D. refers to as "The vital function of Revolutionary Political Action," but rather to its parliamentary aspect.

But before the jury (readers) condemns, and my critic and Judge (J. A. D.) pronounces the penalty, allow me to plead justification for my action—even though my action may be criminal in the eyes of my critic, and worthy of capital punishment.

The reason why I did not lay stress on "The vital function" is simply because it is not the question in dispute. The I.W.W. is not opposed to recruiting on behalf of the Industrial Organisation of Labor. They may object to terming it "Revolutionary Political Action" and rightly so, as it creates confusion by wiping out the distinction between political action and industrial organisation. Nor are they opposed to the part of that "broad conception of Revolutionary Political Action," namely, street corner agitation any more than agitation on the job. What they do stand opposed to is Revolutionary Political Action, as I defined it during the debate, namely, that action on the part of the wage-earners, which aims at capturing political or governmental power, i.e. the position of that political central executive which governs the nation and controls the coercive forces of the dominant class in the community, with the one aim and object of achieving a revolution, i.e., a complete change from capitalist ownership and control of industries—to that of ownership and control of the whole community.

As this, and not the "vital function" was the question in dispute, the question upon which the original I.W.W. split upon, the jury (readers) can at once understand why I committed that horrid crime of devoting my first and second 15 minutes, including the three minutes given to me to reply, to about a half dozen critics, to what Com. J. A. D. refers as "Revolutionary Political Action in its aspect of Parliamentary activity."

The clause in the original I.W.W. Preamble, which says, "Between these two classes a struggle most go on until all the toilers come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field," was a declaration in favor of Revolutionary Political Action. It was not Political Action itself, but only a declaration in its favor. It expressed a desire to achieve the revolution, i.e., the complete change from Capitalism to Socialism, by peaceful methods, by the counting of heads—rather than by smashing them. It also served as a shield under which the actual economic or industrial organisation could develop its strength for the "take and hold" business. It certainly never meant "come together" on street corners, calling upon everybody that passed and cared to listen to join the Industrial Organisation of Labor; what it meant, what it was understood to mean, by both Political and Anti or Non-Political, was, "come together" on election day at the ballot-box. And the question debated on June 24 was, "Is it necessary or essential for the achievement of Socialism or working-class emancipation?"

My opponent (Mr. Brown) opened the debate by announcing a new discovery. It was to the effect that the Australian working-class had become contaminated with a disease which he christened "a political habit." As this horrid disease (though prevalent) was ignored by the medical profession, the I.W.W. decided in the name of humanity to come to the rescue with an antidote, commonly known as "the strike," but to make it high-sounding so as to catch on, they christened it, "Direct Action." Mr. Brown then made an onslaught on "Reform" Political Action: in fact, his criticism was applicable to the "Reform" itself rather than the political action adopted for its realisation. Old Ag: Pensions, Baby

Bonus, Conciliation, and Arbitration, and all the vote-catching schemes of the Labor (?) Party got it hot, but the subject itself, Revolutionary Political Action, escaped without a scratch.

This left nothing for me to reply to, except to remind my friendly opponent that prior to the working-class becoming contaminated with the "political habit," they had badly the pure and simple "Direct Action" habit. And it was the failure of "Direct Action" in the great Maritime Strike that was responsible for that horrid "political habit" of the Australian working class. But, unfortunately, the political action they resorted to, was not Revolutionary, but "Reformist." It was not for the abolition of wage-slavery, but just simply to make that slavery tolerable. They were trying to achieve by means of political action, "Wages Boards" and "Arbitration Courts," and through it what they had previously tried to achieve by means of the strike, i.e., "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work."

But the question I came to discuss was not Political Action v. "Direct Action" for the achievement of higher wages and shorter hours—on this question there is no disagreement. We both believe in Industrial Organisation as against Craft disorganisation; that One Big Union—instead of 710 section unions, could, by means of the strike, at the right time and in the right place—more effectively improve working-class conditions than by "Wages Boards" and "Arbitration Courts," which only grant improvements (?) so long as the (nightmare) threat of the strike weapon is held over their heads, or unless it can be proved beyond dispute that a higher cost of subsistence obtains, and that the increase demanded is not an increase at all, but just avoids a reduction in "real wages"—the purchasing power. The capitalist, as a rule, will offer concessions rather than be involved in too heavy financial losses, but when it comes to a question, he considers vital—especially anything that threatens his very existence as a capitalist—then he and his class will hold out and starve the workers into submission. Their control of industry, and thereby command of wealth (economic power) enables them to do that, and do it effectively. A strike in that case, and especially a "General Strike," would only spell general starvation for the working-class.

The Anarchists and "Direct Actionists," who look to the "General Strike" as the weapon by means of which the working-class will achieve their emancipation, will not doubt, inform us that they will answer this capitalist starvation business, with a seizure of food supplies. This would not be bad, if they could only provide a guarantee that those doing the seizing would not be facing machine guns and digesting lead.

The workers cannot achieve their emancipation by pitting themselves against the guns and armed forces of the capitalist class. They must either get control of these, by capturing the governmental machine, or win the greater part of it over to our side; neither can be accomplished without first winning over the great bulk of the people (particularly the working-class) in favor of the Revolution, i.e., the change from Capitalism to Socialism. And I ask, is there anything more effective to accomplish this—especially where "political democracy" obtains, than Revolutionary Political Action?

Revolutionary Political Action is necessary or essential, because it offers us the opportunity—as nothing else does—of propagating the Revolution, of spreading the principles of Socialism amongst the great mass of the people, without which its accomplishment (it matters not what action we may take) is impossible. It is necessary, because it deprives the ruling class of the opportunity of successfully crushing the movement by brute force. It makes it easy for us to prove that we have no desire or love for bloodshed (thus depriving them of a valuable pretext), and that our aim to achieve the Revolution is by peaceful methods—by the counting of heads, etc. It places the responsibility of causing bloodshed on the shoulders of the capitalist class. The value of placing responsibility for bloodshed on the enemy, in its effect on the minds of the people, in securing their co-operation and support, is well recognised by all the governments of the nations at war. Not even the most despotic dare own up responsibility. It explains why the ruling classes of the world have always endeavored by means of their two principal agencies—the press and the church—to delude the people into the belief that Socialists stand for destruction and bloodshed by

saddling them with the deeds of anarchists, and still bloodier deeds of their own "agent provocateurs."

Revolutionary Political Action is not only an effort to capture the government of a country on behalf of Socialism and working-class emancipation, but it is also a periodical referendum on the issue of Socialism v. Capitalism. And being conscious of the fact, that one of the most prominent of the "non-political" politicals—the person who, according to J. A. D. "pierced the weak point in the case for the attempt to capture control of the coercive forces of government through the parliamentary machine," because he said something about "a capital outrage on the economic field precipitating war," as a reason why we should reject Revolutionary Political Action, and thus give that class a show in their precipitating business; this person, who argued against Revolutionary Political Action, advised us in a lecture at the A. S. P. Hall that, in the event of conscription being the issue, we should drop our opposition and vote solid for Labor (?) candidates. And being further conscious of the fact that, at least 90, if not 99, per cent. of the "non-politicals" voted against conscription on the 28th October last, I could not for the life of me resist the temptation of putting the following question to them: "Why the use of the ballot box to defeat conscription by legal enactment, and yet at the same time refuse to use the same to defeat Capitalism, with its economic conscription, conscription enforced by the process of slow starvation? I ask, where is the logic and consistency in such an attitude?"

It may be argued, of course, that in voting against conscription, it was a vote for a principle, a vote for life and liberty, and not for a person—even though that person may be a Socialist candidate, but this answer would only hold good if what I was advocating that night was not Revolutionary Political Action, but just ordinary political or parliamentary action. Here an indignant voice yelled, "What is the difference, anyhow?" It was the voice of our heated, almost boiling, friend, Lawrence, who, according to Com. J. A. D., "was much nearer the mark when he defined political action 'as speaking off the soap-box and at street corners, etc.'" Of course, I must confess my ignorance in not realising that Chummy Fleming (Anarchist) and Percy Brunton ("Peanut King") were, in spite of their protests to the contrary, full-blown political actionists. When this heated and most extreme of the I.W.W. expressed himself to the effect that had the German workers invested their savings, not in the war loan, but in bars of soap for a general upheaval of boilers, they could have stopped the war, which they failed to do through political action and the election of Socialists to Parliament; it made me think, and think hard, not for an answer to this most profound wisdom, which was altogether beyond me, but how in the name of heaven could they be accused (in view of this most profound advice to the Germans) of being "enemies to the Empire," and "in the pay of Kaiser Bill?" Surely, this is a clear case for libel against the Australian Bill.

However, I must apologise for getting away from the subject. The difference between Revolutionary Political Action and ordinary Political or Parliamentary Action is simply this:—

In one case, Socialism is made the issue, the text question, the question to be voted upon. A true Socialist or Working-Class Party would see that this is the text question. In the other, Socialism is placed in the background, hidden away under a blanket for fear it may frighten away what they are pleased to term the "sympathetic" or "timid" vote, and, instead of Socialism, a whole list of so-called ameliorative measures are placed in the forefront as bait for catching votes.

The candidate appeals for votes—not on behalf of a principle, but for his own pet self, because he is absolutely certain that he is a "more fit and proper person to represent—not one class, but all classes in the constituency." In this case, of course, you vote not for a principle, but for a person, a so-called "Labor" man, as against a Liberal or Conservative, a so-called "Socialist," in place of a "Laborite," and so on. But in Revolutionary Political Action, where the issue is Socialism v. Capitalism, you vote not for a person, but for a principle. And, in so far as Capitalism, with its fraud and corruption, its unemployment and poverty, with its antagonism of interests between classes and nation, is responsible for the wholesale destruction of human life and civil liberty, a vote for So-

cialism is therefore much more a vote for life and liberty than even the vote against conscription. It is true, that in securing a majority vote against conscription, you elect no candidate, whereas in the other you do. But this only means that in one case you leave it to the person who fought you "tooth and nail," and in the most despicable manner at that to carry out your wishes, whereas, in the other, you displace the person who fought against you, by another who is the advocate and standard bearer of the principle you voted for: which, I ask, is the more preferable of the two? So the question still awaits an answer.

Revolutionary Political Action presupposes the existence to some extent at least, of "political democracy." When this does not obtain, where the workers are denied the franchise and the right of free speech, press and assembly; denied, in other words, the right to achieve their economic emancipation by the peaceful method (the capture of government through the ballot box), then other action becomes not only necessary, but justified. Under these conditions, individuals of the movement may suffer from the tyranny and brutality of the ruling class, but the movement itself does not suffer. On the contrary, its progress is even greater than in the countries where the capitalist class can boast of "democracy" and "freedom." Russia gives us a good illustration of this.

But where, on the other hand, political democracy obtains, a Revolutionary Working-Class Organisation cannot ignore the peaceful method of achieving the revolution without endangering the liberty of its most active members and the progress of the movement itself. The fact that 12 members of the I.W.W. could be sentenced on flimsy circumstantial evidence up to 15 years' imprisonment without arousing general indignation at its brutality and the further fact that Hughes on top of this, could declare the I.W.W. an "illegal association," even with the support of the so-called "Labor" Party, surely proves what I say.

An industrial organisation that is not revolutionary, and does not go beyond demanding "preference to unionists" and "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work" can safely ignore political action and raise the cry of "no politics inside the union," as does "American Federation of Labor." Such an organisation will always win the praise and blessings of the Capitalist Class, who prefer it as against those unions who go in for independent political action.

"We are not opposed to Unionism" yelled the nominees of the Capitalist Class, during a Federal election. "What we object to is—political unionism." If there is no value in political action, if "the ballot box is only a capitalist scheme to delude the workers," why this objection, considering that the politics of these unions do not go beyond (what I have already pointed out) electing "Labor" men to Parliament, with the idea of achieving by means of legislation what they would otherwise try to achieve by means of the strike? How much more would they object if these unions, instead of having as their objective "a fair day's work for a fair day's wage," sought to gain political power with the idea of wiping out Capitalism with its fraud and corruption, and other blessings, and establish in its place an industrial democracy?

Here in Australia we had the manufacturers or "Protectionists" fighting "tooth and nail" against the importers and "Freetraders," the Liberals representing the shopkeepers and the smaller fry of the Capitalist Class fighting bitterly against the Conservatives, representing the large capitalists and landed interests; but when a Party, claiming the name of Labor, enters into the political arena, and catching on to everything that is popular and likely to catch votes, grows, until finally it captures the reins of government, then these various factions immediately sink their sectional interests, and at once recognise their common or class interests; capitalists and landlords; manufacturers and importers, all forget their quarrels; unite forces in order to regain control of government. This in spite of the fact that leaders of the so-called "Labor" Party assured them on more than one occasion, that they have no intention of "driving capital out of the country," or of going in for a "general nationalisation of industry." If there is no value in political action—why this sudden unity of the capitalist class, in face of the assurance of the Labor (?) misleaders? Does it not prove conclusively, what our anti-politicals fail to realise, that the capitalist class

Continued on page 4.

REVOLUTIONARY POLITICAL ACTION.

A CRITICISM OF A CRITIC.

Continued from page 3.

realises only too well the value of political action; it is the means by which they generally defeat the "Direct Action" of the workers. No class would be more pleasant at the success of our anti-politicals, in inducing the working class to give up political action than the capitalist class; as they are not altogether blind to the fact that their political representatives would more willingly obey orders to utilise the forces of the State, against the workers, when once they are assured that their political jobs will not be endangered as a result of it. Should our anti-politicals succeed, I say that the capitalist class would owe them a deep debt of gratitude.

But "Parliament is a corrupting machine" screams the Anarchists, Syndicalists, Anti-Politicals generally in chorus. "The moment you put a man into Parliament, then he is partially lost to the movement. The environment gets the better of him, and he ultimately turns traitor to the principles, and the very movement that put him there." "Take a man away from the field, the mine and the factory and place him in parliament with soft cushions and twelve pounds a week, away from the hovel he lived in, into a palace in comparison, away from the companionship of his work-mates, into the company of plutocracy's political representatives, and he will soon forget the class he sprang from, and become the willing tool of the capitalist class!"—Donald Grant on the "Yarra Bank."

This argument, no doubt, sounds very plausible, but, unfortunately, it completely ignores the most vital factor of a politician's environment, namely, the constituency and the elector, upon whose favor the luxuries of Parliament are absolutely dependent. For the sake of the £12 and the soft cushions, politicians have noses to the ground, scenting which way the political wind is blowing. If conscription appears popular and anti-conscriptionists are getting it hot and strong, they will yell for conscription. But no sooner is there a change, and conscriptionists get a taste of the medicine formerly served out to anti-conscriptionists—in which case they will absolutely deny that they ever favored conscription—"Conscription! Never!" Not even the "Saviour of the Empire" would make it the election issue, even though the "Empire may go to pieces (?) and Australia becomes the prey (?) of the Huns."

The same applies to Socialism. So long as it is not understood, and therefore unpopular, so long will we have a so-called Socialist (?) (whose objective is not Socialism, but to get into Parliament), drop the principle in order to achieve his objective and get in. Before a Socialist audience he may announce himself "a straight-out Socialist," but "mum" is the word before any other. But given a condition where Socialism is understood and popular; given a Socialist constituency, and it is a million to one that the person elected will stand true. Not because—being a Socialist—he is a better, a more honest and conscientious man. He may be, or may not be, according to environment and heredity, but when honesty and material interests harmonise, then honesty and not dishonesty, scores.

The assertion that "Parliament is a corrupting machine," would lead one to believe that Capitalism is not. It is not Capitalism that breeds fraud and corruption, but only a particular institution inside the system (the parliamentary machine) that is at fault. It is not the capitalist class that does, as a rule, the bribing and the corrupting of the government officials and politicians; and this same class could not do so if once the working-class movement rejected political action entirely and took "direct action" alone, as a means of achieving working-class bodies of men, while actively engaged, not in political action, but in "direct action" (a strike), who have been betrayed by their industrial leaders (?), or rather, misleaders? Unless our anti-politicals can prove that such has never occurred, then their whole argument falls to the ground. You do not escape the degenerating and corrupting influence of Capitalism by rejecting political action.

Fraud, corruption and betrayal can creep in, in a purely industrial organisation, as much, if not more so, than in a political organisation. A system that offers no security of economic tenure, in which no one knows the day when he may be out of a job and deprived of his means of livelihood and reduced to absolute poverty and starvation, I say, such a system as this must naturally breed degenerates, criminals, and those types of individuals who would not only betray principles and movements, but would swear away the very lives of their fellow-men. An Orchard, a McPartland and others of these types can find no scope in a Revolutionary Political Party or even in a Revolutionary Industrial Organisation that openly repudiates "sabotage," and declares for Political Action for achieving the Revolution, i.e., W.I.U. They could only succeed in their dirty work on behalf of capital-

The Australian Socialist Party.



NEWS AND NOTES.

MELBOURNE BRANCH.

Members of this branch are keenly alive to the necessity of their class being united in the class struggle, and in doing their share towards the social ownership of the means of production and distribution in industry, the acceptance of Revolutionary Industrial Unionism, no political trading, anti-militarism, and the international and correlated interests of Labor.

Action, and not theories, will bring about Socialism. With this end in view, a propaganda committee has been formed, composed of this branch's most vigorous members, who, having studied economics from their class basis, are anxious to bring about unity with all bodies having the same objective basis.

Activities are all in a healthy state in this branch, and with the hall let for several evenings each week, finances are giving less worry to those members who have battled through earlier difficulties, and are now beginning to see the result of good and hard work.

Attendances at the Sunday lectures are increasing, due to better advertising, and, per-

ism, in falsely swearing away the lives of the most active members of an organisation that stands for "Direct Action" only. If we are to give up political action, because a few have turned traitors, or because certain Socialist Political Parties are too much of the "milk and water" type, and are not as militant and revolutionary as we should have liked them to be, then, surely, to be logical, we must also give up "Direct Action" for the very same reasons. But, evidently, logic worries not anti-politicals, for they agree that it is foolish to give up the right to strike ("Direct Action") because of failures, betrayals, and scabbery, but by all means reject political action—for reasons no more condemning. I ask an absurdity go further? You may ignore political action, but will the political action of the capitalist class ignore you?

What is essential to counteract the corrupting influence of capitalism is not to run away from the political field, any more than from the industrial field, but to build up an organisation with definite principles and methods—one in which the rank and file takes an interest and active part in its work—which alone can prevent it from falling into the hands of political opportunists, and from being side-tracked into a purely vote-catching machine like the so-called Labor (?) Party. It is essential to have an organisation that will not run away from its principles at the most critical times. Desertions may be profitable, while the movement and its principles are unpopular, but the reverse is the case when once these principles become widespread and popular.

It is here where Revolutionary Political Action comes in. Its mission is to popularise Socialism and create constituencies of Socialists, to convert and gain the numbers for the Revolution, the change from Capitalism to Socialism. The industrial organisation, to organise the numbers according to industry for its democratic control. Once we have the numbers, and organised at that, I care not a brass farthing what action the capitalist class may take as a last resort.

"All previous historical movements," says the Communist Manifesto, "were movements of minorities, or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority."

The capitalist class use both the economic and the political weapon to keep the workers under; the working-class movement must meet them in both fields to achieve their economic emancipation.

Revolutionary Political Action will secure the numbers for the capture of governments and its coercive forces, for the abolition of Capitalism. The Industrial Organisation of Labor—for construction—will secure the establishment of a system which would gradually render the political machine and its coercion unnecessary, see the establishment of an industrial democracy. Both types of organisation and action are essential for its achievement.

haps to the fact that many of the workers are waking up to there being something wrong somewhere, which their much trusted politicians cannot remedy. Recent events having proved that so-called politicians are so much chaff blown by the wind, and not only in their own individual interests; the thinking members of the working class are forced by economic circumstances to look elsewhere for a deliverance than in a parliament, in which the interests of Capitalism are considered first, with the workers a bad second.

The library has had several new books added, including that splendid work on evolution, "The Universal Kinship," by the late Professor Howard Moore, whose death has been deplored by all studious Socialists; "Socialism and War" (Bondin), and the series of "The Mysteries of the People" (Eugene Sire,) translated from the French by Daniel De Leon.

"Barbarous Mexico" was the subject of an address by Mrs. J. Macdonald at the Hall on August 12th.

J. M. Min. Sec.

SYDNEY BRANCH

A very successful meeting was held in Liverpool street, August 19th, the speakers being W. Gay, P. Drew and A. S. Reardon. A large crowd gathered around to hear the speakers, and at the close of the meeting many questions were asked. A record sale of papers was also established, close on forty dozen being sold on the Domain and at street meetings.

The economic class and dance have had to be discontinued, owing to the strike, but will be resumed again immediately those "disloyal" workers come to a sense of their "duty" and begin work.

M. REARDON, Secretary.

Education After the War.

FROM "A DOMINIE DISMISSED."

By A. S. NEILL, M.A.

"I see that many eminent people are making speeches about 'Education after the War.' I can detect but little difference between their attitude and that of the commercial men who keep shouting, 'Capture Germany's Trade!'"

"Let us have more technical instruction," cries the educationalist, "more discipline: let us beat Germany at her own game!" The commercial man chuckles. "Excellent!" he cries. "First rate. . . . but of course we must have protection also!"

And the educationalist and the commercial man will have their way. Education will aim frankly at turning out highly efficient wage-slaves. The New Education has commenced; the first act was to abolish freedom.

The alarming feature of the present Prussianisation of Britain lies in the circumstance that the signing of peace will be but the beginning of a new war. If the plans of the Paris Economic Conference are carried out, true education is interred for a century. Millions have lost their lives in the military war; millions will lose their souls in the trade war. Just as we have sullenly obeyed the dictates of the war government, we shall sullenly obey the dictates of the trade government. "We must win the trade war," our rulers will cry, and if the profiteers say that men must work sixteen hours a day, if we are to beat Germany, the Press and the Church and the School will persuade the public that the man who strikes for a fifteen hours' day is a traitor to his country.

Will anyone try to save education? The commercial men will use it to further their own plans; the educationalists will unconsciously play into the profiteers' hands; the women. . . . only the other day the suffrage band was marching through the streets of London, displaying a huge banner, bearing the words, "We want Hughes." Hughes is the Premier of Australia, a Labor man, dear to the hearts of all the capitalist newspapers. His one text is "Trade after the war."

Who is there to save education? The teaching profession could save it, but teachers are merely servants. They will continue to argue about compulsory Greek, and, no doubt, compulsory Russian will come up for discussion in the educational papers soon. The commercially-minded gentlemen of Westminster will draw up the new scheme of education, and the teachers will humbly adapt themselves to the new method.

I don't think that anyone will save education."

TO UNATTACHED SUPPORTERS.

Whoever you are, if you believe in Scientific Socialism, you must recognise the need for organisation. Why not set a good example to the workers whom you come in contact with, and whom we know you try to educate, by joining up with the A.S.P.

If there is no BRANCH in your locality, you can become a MEMBER AT LARGE, and thus become a REAL LIVE WIRE.

For further information, drop a line to the General Secretary, A.S.P., 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

Any branch desiring matter published under the above heading, should write clearly what is needed, and forward same to this office.

BROKEN HILL.

Socialist Hall, Sulphide St.

All rebels making their way to the "Hill" will receive a welcome at the above address.

MELBOURNE BRANCH.

47 Victoria St., Melbourne.

Library and Reading Room for members. Lectures held every Sunday Evening. Economic Class every Wednesday evening. Visitors welcomed.

MT. LARCOM.

Secretary, Chas. Jacobsen, Mt. Larcom, via Gladston.

NEWTOWN BRANCH.

Hall: Hatte's Arcade, King St., Newtown.

Library for Members. Business meeting held alternate Thursday evening. Propaganda meetings held every Saturday and Sunday Evenings, at Newtown Bridge.

SYDNEY BRANCH.

Hall: 369 Pitt St., City.

Library for members. Lecture every Sunday evening. Debating class held every Monday evening. Business meeting every alternate Thursday evening. Dance every Friday evening.

AUSTRALASIAN SOCIALIST PARTY LITERATURE DEPARTMENT.

Ancient Lowly—C. Osborne Ward; 2 vols., cloth, 16/-; posted 16/6.
Ancient Society—Lewis H. Morgan; cloth, 6/-; posted, 6/3.
Britain for the British—R. Blatchford; paper cover, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Capital—Karl Marx; 3 vols., 8/- each; posted, 8/6.
Charles Darwin and Karl Marx—E. Aveling; paper, 3d.; posted, 4d.
Economic Discontent—Father T. J. Hagerty; paper, 2d.; posted, 3d.
Economics of Socialism—H. M. Hyndman; cloth, 3/6; posted, 3/9.
Human Slaughter House—W. Lamazus; paper, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
Introduction to Socialism—N. A. Richardson; paper, 3d.; posted, 4d.
Merrie England—R. Blatchford; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Mutual Aid—P. Kropotkin; paper, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
New Socialism, The—R. R. La-Monte; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Put up the Sword—Adela Pankhurst; paper, 2/6; posted, 2/9.
Positive School of Crimonology—Enrico Ferri; cloth, 2/-; posted, 2/2.
Principles of Scientific Socialism—Rev. Vaie; paper, 1/-; posted, 1/1.
Right to be Lazy—P. Lafargue; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Socialism the Goal of Civilisation—paper, 2d.; posted, 3d.

IMPORTANT.

When ordering literature it is well to add the cost of registration (3d.). This is necessary to guarantee delivery.

Printed and Published by William Joseph Thomas, at 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney, for the Australian Socialist Party.